

**Remarks**

The Office Action mailed October 5, 2005 has been carefully reviewed and the following remarks are made in consequence thereof.

Claims 2-9 and 11-18 remain in this Application. Claims 1 and 10 are cancelled. Claims 2, 3, 9, 11, 12, and 18 are currently amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 2-8 and 11-17 stand objected to. Claims 1, 9, 10, and 18 stand rejected.

A fee calculation sheet for the additional independent claims in this Application accompanies this Amendment. A conditional authorization to charge the deposit account any additional necessary fees entry of this Amendment, including, but not limited to, any necessary extension of time is included in the fee calculation sheet.

The rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is respectfully traversed.

This rejection no longer applies to Claims 1 and 10, which have been cancelled.

The Office rejected Claims 1-18 because of the recitation of "controlling the level of the drum." This phrase has been corrected in newly independent Claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 to read "controlling drum level." It is submitted that this phrase is consistent with the recitations in the remaining claims and the specification and also with other accepted usage (see Chamberlain, U.S. 4,242,989, already of record, at Abstract, col. 1, lines 25-26, col. 2, lines 55-56, and elsewhere). Thus, it is submitted that this rejection no longer applies to independent Claims 2, 3, 11, and 12.

Claims 4-8 and 14-18 depend directly or indirectly upon one of Claims 2, 3, 11, or 12. When the recitations of any of Claims 4-8 and 14-18 is considered in combination with the recitations of the corresponding independent Claim, it is submitted that this rejection also does not apply to Claims 4-8 and 14-18.

For the above reasons, it is requested that the rejection of Claims 1-18 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1, 9, 10, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chamberlain 4,242,989 in view of Rowe et al. US 2005/0045117 is respectfully traversed.

This rejection no longer applies to Claims 1 and 10, which have been cancelled.

Claims 9 and 18 have been amended to be dependent upon Claims 2 and 11, respectively, which have been acknowledged by the Office as containing allowable subject matter. When the recitations of Claims 9 and 18 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claims 2 and 11, respectively, it is submitted that Claims 9 and 18 are likewise allowable.

For these reasons, it is requested that the rejection of Claims 1, 9, 10, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chamberlain 4,242,989 in view of Rowe et al. US 2005/0045117 be withdrawn.

The objection to Claims 2-8 and 11-17 is respectfully traversed.

The Office indicated that these claims contained allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 2, 3, 11, and 12 have been rewritten in this manner, so it is submitted that this objection no longer applies to these claims.

Claims 4-8 are directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 3. When the recitations of Claims 4-8 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 3, it is submitted that Claims 4-8 are likewise allowable.

Claims 13-17 are directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 12. When the recitations of Claims 13-17 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 12, it is submitted that Claims 13-17 are likewise allowable.

In view of the foregoing remarks, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is therefore respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: January 4, 2006

Alan Cassel

Alan L. Cassel  
Registration No. 35,842  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070